

THE ALEXANDRIAN ORIGIN OF THE
CHRISTIAN TOPOGRAPHY OF
COSMAS INDICOPLEUSTES

BY

MILTON V. ANASTOS

This article, which is the first of a series of investigations on Cosmas, is a revised version of a short section of a paper read before the Symposium on Byzantine and Medieval Art and History conducted by Professor George La Piana at Dumbarton Oaks (April 29–May 1, 1943).

The remaining portion of this study, left unfinished on account of war work, contains an analysis of Cosmas's indebtedness to ancient science (Aristotle and Ptolemy) and a discussion of Cosmas's Nestorianism.

I am grateful to Professors R. P. Blake, W. R. W. Koehler, and George La Piana for advice, and to Miss Margaret Rathbone, Mrs. Nathalie Scheffer, Mrs. Eugene Bland, Miss M. H. Beale, and Miss Persis Mason for invaluable assistance. I am indebted to Dr. Joshua Starr for his kindness in verifying the reference to the *Life of Mar Aba* in note 34.

M. V. A.

WHEN Montfaucon published the *editio princeps* of the *Christian Topography* in the *Collectio Nova Patrum et Scriptorum Graecorum*, he believed that it was written by Cosmas in Egypt.¹ A. Galland was also of this opinion,² as were Fabricius³ and the chief representatives of early criticism.⁴ But this theory was challenged in 1883 by H. Gelzer,⁵ who asserted that near the end of his life Cosmas settled down in a monastery at Raithu⁶ on the Sinai peninsula and there devoted himself to literary labors, of which the *Christian Topography* is the only surviving monument. Krumbacher⁷ followed Gelzer here and found a warm supporter in Strzygowski,⁸ who seized upon the statement of the Sinaitic authorship of Cosmas's work as proof of his theory of the Syrian origin of the famous Cosmas miniatures. In the meantime, however, J. W. McCrindle had brought out an English translation of the *Christian Topography*, and had stated that Cosmas returned to Alexandria after his travels and there⁹ composed his only extant work [ca. 550].¹⁰ He apparently regarded the matter as so certain that he did not feel the necessity of marshalling arguments to prove the point. E. O. Winstedt, the editor of the only critical text, belongs to the same school of thought.¹¹ But neither McCrindle nor Winstedt made use of Gelzer's researches. Indeed, Krumbacher in a review¹² reproaches McCrindle for failing to read and utilize Gelzer's article. The result, as one might expect, is chaos and confusion. Some contemporary writers pronounce boldly for the Alexandrian provenance,¹³ others for the Sinaitic;¹⁴ one group expresses perplexity or indecision,¹⁵ and still another preserves a discreet silence.¹⁶

But there is no need for such uncertainty. Gelzer does not adduce any respectable support whatsoever for his theory. He argues¹⁷ that the country about Sinai had been traversed so often by Cosmas that it had acquired a high emotional value in his sight and was for this reason chosen as a suitable place for his last days. He relies on the statement of Cosmas in the second book of the *Christian Topography* that his friend Menas, who had accompanied him on his archaeological expedition to Axum, had joined the monastic settlement at Raithu.¹⁸ Gelzer makes much of the fact that Cosmas had an intimate knowledge of the topography and local traditions of the Sinai peninsula, that he was familiar with the Semitic inscriptions¹⁹ found in that area, and that he had observed the wheel-ruts at Clyisma, which he knew were regarded as mute witnesses of Pharaoh's charioteers and the miraculous defeat of the Egyptians during the flight of the chosen people across the Red Sea. But, to say nothing of the numerous medieval writers and pilgrims²⁰ who knew and revered these same Sinaitic monuments, none

of the passages cited by Gelzer bears out his hypothesis. Had Cosmas been a monk at Sinai, it is strange that his description of this region does not give the slightest hint that he had ever been more than a tourist there.²¹

The reason is, of course, that he was an Alexandrian and wrote the *Christian Topography* in Alexandria. There cannot be the slightest wavering or hesitancy about this. To begin with, in dedicating his book to Pamphilus, Cosmas writes of the time "when by the will of God you came to us here in Alexandria."²² Further proof is to be found in the sixth book, which is of particular importance in view of the fact that Books 1-5 and 6-12 form separate entities.²³ In three passages²⁴ at this point Cosmas mentions the astronomical observations which he and the presbyter Stephen of Antioch had made in Alexandria. The texts are clear and decisive, and the adverb ἐνταῦθα is used in such a way as to leave no doubt that Cosmas means to say "here in Alexandria." Equally conclusive is his reference to the river Nile as τοῦ παρ' ἡμῖν Νείλου ποταμοῦ.²⁵ Moreover, in his general description of the extent of the world, Alexandria is always prominently mentioned.²⁶ The Mediterranean is ἡ ἡμετέρα θάλασσα,²⁷ and the Egyptian names of the months are used throughout.²⁸ Finally, in quoting excerpts from the sermons of the Patriarchs Timothy and Theodosius of Alexandria, he usually gives the exact date of the homily and the name of the church in which it was preached.²⁹ Not without interest in this connection is the fact that at the end of the seventh book of the *Christian Topography* Cosmas quotes two prayers (*περὶ τῶν προσφερόντων* and *περὶ τῶν κεκοιμημένων*) which seem to be derived from an early form of the Alexandrian rite, the *Liturgy of St. Mark*.^{29a}

Having proved that the *Christian Topography* was written in Alexandria, we are now in a position to illuminate Cosmas's references to Patricius³⁰ (better known as Mar Aba, Catholicos of Persia from 540 to 552), who together with Thomas of Edessa gave a series of lectures on theology and cosmology which Cosmas must have attended. Cosmas himself tells us that he received

oral instruction from Patricius, that very holy man and great teacher, . . .
who came here from the land of the Chaldaeans together with Thomas of
Edessa, . . . who . . . died in Constantinople.

O. Braun³¹ wrongly took this passage to mean that Cosmas studied under Mar Aba at Constantinople. In so doing he seems to have led astray other scholars like Chabot, Baumstark, and Labourt,³² all of whom failed to perceive that a few lines previously Cosmas had described himself as writing in Alexandria.³³ The non-Greek evidence accords perfectly with this fact, for we learn from the *Chronique de Séert*³⁴ that Mar Aba and Thomas of

Edessa visited Alexandria and offered what might be called a joint course on the works of Theodore of Mopsuestia. Mar Aba lectured in Syriac, and Thomas translated into Greek, until pressure from Alexandrian churchmen, who, as Monophysites, naturally resented the popularity and success of their Nestorian rivals, forced them to flee to Constantinople. Thomas died in the capital;³⁵ and Mar Aba, faced once more with persecution, took to flight again and escaped to Persia.

Cosmas may or may not have been a monk, as he is designated in the MSS.;³⁶ he says nothing about any personal experience he may have had with the monastic life. But there is no compelling reason to doubt, as some have done, that he actually bore the name Cosmas.³⁷ In any case, it is clear that our author, whether monk or not, and whatever his name may have been, wrote in Alexandria and not on Mount Sinai. It is to be hoped, therefore, that we shall hear no more of the alleged Sinaitic provenience of the *Christian Topography*. Strzygowski's followers, if such there be, will have to turn elsewhere for proof of their theory.

NOTES

1. Volume 2 (Paris, 1706), 113 ff. See the title page (reprinted in *MPG*, 88, 51); in *caput primum* of his preface Montfaucon refers to Cosmas as "Aegyptius Alexandrinus." Only a few unimportant fragments had been published before Montfaucon; see *MPG*, 88, 9 ff., and the literature cited in notes 4 and 16 *infra*.
2. *Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum*, 11 (Venice, 1776), xviii: *Cosmas Aegyptius, et quidem Alexandrinus*; Calland published the Greek text with a Latin translation.
3. *Bibliotheca Graeca*, ed. G. C. Harles, 4 (Hamburg, 1795, reprinted in *MPG*, 88, 23 f.), 253 n.h., 257.
4. R. Ceillier, *Histoire générale des auteurs sacrés et ecclésiastiques*, 2d. ed., 11 (Paris, 1862), 186; W. Cave, *Scriptorum ecclesiasticorum historia literaria*, 1 (Basel, 1741), 515. It has not seemed worthwhile to give references to all the older handbooks, encyclopaedias, and authorities (like Allatius, Assemani, Oudin, etc.), whose testimony, after all, matters little; the necessary bibliographical indications can be found in the works cited in my notes and also, in part, in U. Chevalier, *Répertoire des sources historiques du moyen âge, Bio-bibliographie*, 1 (Paris, 1905), 1056 f.
5. "Kosmas der Indienfahrer," *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie*, 9 (1883), 105–141.
6. *Ibid.*, 110 f.; on Cosmas's identification of Raithu as the ancient Elim (modern Tor), see L. Prévost, L. Dennefeld, etc., *Le Sinai hier . . . aujourd'hui*, an admirable little book (Paris, 1937), 161; and Winstedt's note *ad loc.*, 338 (see n. 18 *infra*); cf. also Lina Eckenstein, *History of Sinai* (London, 1921), 119 f. The contrary supposition of R. Weill, *La presqu'île du Sinai* (Paris, 1908), 225, that Cosmas never even visited Sinai, is groundless, as the note of Weill himself, *loc. cit.*, clearly demonstrates. Schiwietz, "Die altchristliche Tradition über den Berg Sinai und Kosmas Indikopleustes," *Der Katholik*, 4. Folge, 38 (1908), 9–30, does not concern himself with the provenance of the *Christian Topography*; cf. p. 26 on Elim. For full bibliographies see C. J. Jellouschek, "Eine Sinaifahrt," *Theologische Studien d. Österr. Leo-Gesellschaft*, 37 (Vienna, 1938), 6 f., 23 ff., and *passim*.
7. *Geschichte d. byzantinischen Litteratur*, 2d ed. (Munich, 1897), 412 ff.

8. *Der Bilderkreis des griechischen Physiologus, des Kosmas Indikopleustes u. Oktateuch, Byzantinisches Archiv*, Heft 2 (Leipzig, 1899), 54, 99 ff. In his review of C. Stornajolo, *Le miniature della Topografia Cristiana di Cosma I.* (Milan, 1908), *BZ*, 18 (1909), 672 ff., Strzygowski mentions Stornajolo's view that Cosmas was an Alexandrian but does not comment further; see n. 13 *infra*.

9. London, 1897, ii, iv, viii.

10. The approximate date can be established by internal evidence. In Book II Cosmas says that his visit to Axum took place during the reign of Justin (518-27), roughly twenty-five years before the composition of the *Christian Topography*: E. O. Winstedt, ed., *Christian Topography of Cosmas Indicopleustes* (Cambridge, Eng., 1909), 72.25 ff. The eclipses mentioned by Cosmas in Book VI (*op. cit.*, 232.18 ff.) are assigned to the year 547 by Jacob Krall, "Studien zur Geschichte des alten Aegypten," *Sitzungsber. der k. Ak. der Wiss., Philos.-hist. Cl.*, 121 (Vienna, 1890), Abh. 11, 72.

This evidence (cf. Winstedt, *op. cit.*, 5 f., 25 f.) would seem to indicate that the *C.T.* was written sometime between *ca.* 543 and 552. It should be noted, however, that Book VI, like Books VII-X (and perhaps XII), was written specifically to deal with special points arising out of the controversy provoked by Books I-V. This does not necessarily mean that Books I-V were written before 547, or that all of the material in Books VII-XII is to be dated after 547. Book XI (and possibly XII) seem to have been excerpted from a work or works by Cosmas which had no generic connection with the *C.T.* Occasional miscalculations like that of J. P. Junglas, *Leontius von Byzanz* (*Forschungen zur christlichen Lit. u. Dogmengeschichte*, 7, Heft 3, Paderborn, 1908), 64, who dates the *C.T.* between 537 and 543, do not deserve consideration.

11. *Op. cit.*, 3. The Teubner edition by Georg Sieffert, announced in *BZ*, 4 (1895), 645, never appeared. For reviews of Winstedt's edition see *BZ*, 19 (1910), 605; 20 (1911), 312; 21 (1912-13), 246-8 (by Otto Stählin).

12. *BZ*, 8 (1899), 550 f.; Gelzer's paper is described as a *wichtige Abhandlung*.

13. The historians of art are almost unanimous: C. R. Morey, *Early Christian Art* (Princeton, 1942), 79 ff.; Kurt Weitzmann, *Die byzantinische Buchmalerei des 9. u. 10. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin, 1935), 5 (see also the literature cited on p. 4); D. T. Rice, *Byzantine Art* (Oxford, 1935), 131 (Egypt); C. Diehl, *Manuel d'art byzantin*, 2d ed., 1 (Paris, 1925), 240 ff.; Stornajolo, *op. cit.*, 5 f. Cf. E. K. Riedin, *Khristianskaiā Topografiā Koz'my Indikoplova po grecheskim i russkim spiskam* (ed. D. V. Ainalov, Moscow, 1916), 34 ff.; N. Kondakoff, *Histoire de l'art byzantin considéré principalement dans les miniatures*, 1 (Paris, 1886), 141, and *idem*, *Puteshestvie na Sinaï* (Zapiski Imp. Novorossiiskogo Universiteta, 33, Odessa, 1882, pt. 3), 120, 137-43.

Here also belongs the excellent article by H. Leclercq in the *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne*, 8 (Paris, 1928), 820 f. Especially worthy of mention is J. Wittmann, *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Cosmas* (Borna-Leipzig, 1913), 1. Cf. A. A. Vasiliev, *Histoire de l'empire byzantin*, 1 (Paris, 1932), 215 ff.; L. Duchesne, *L'Église au vi^e siècle* (Paris, 1925), 315 ff.; J. B. Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire*, 2 (London, 1923), 319; and E. Mangenot in the *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, 3 (Paris, 1908), 1916.

14. A number of writers have followed Gelzer and Krumbacher on this point. The most important are: R. Hennig, *Terrae incognitae*, 2 (Leiden, 1937), 47; L. Bréhier in A. Flliche and V. Martin, *Histoire de l'Église*, 4 (Paris, 1937), 557; E. G. Pantelakes in Μεγάλη Ἑλληνικὴ Ἐγκυλοπαίδεια, 14 (Athens, 1930), 949; Efron-Brockhaus, *Novyi Entsiklopedicheskii Slovar'*, (Petrograd, n.d.), 111; J. L. Heiberg, "Et Christent Verdensbilledede," *Studier fra Sprolog og Oldtidsforskning, Udgivne af Det Filologisk-Historiske Samfund*, Nr. 138 (Copenhagen, 1926), 5. Wecker in Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, *Real-encyclopädie*, 11 (Stuttgart, 1922), 1487; M. Jugie, "Abraham d'Éphèse et ses écrits," *BZ*, 22 (1913), 45; C. Diehl, *Justinien et la civilisation byzantine au vi^e siècle* (Paris, 1901), xxiv.

15. O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*, 5 (Freiburg i. B., 1932), 95, regards the Sinaitic theory as *nicht ausreichend begründet*; so does F. X. Schühlein,

Lexikon für Theologie u. Kirche, 6 (Freiburg i. B., 1934), 219 f. See also O. M. Dalton, *East Christian art* (Oxford, 1925), 318, and the same writer's *Byzantine art and archaeology* (*ibid.*, 1911), 461 f. E. T. Charton, *Voyageurs anciens et modernes*, 2 (Paris, 1863), 1, hesitates between Alexandria and Jerusalem.

16. N. Iorga, *Histoire de la vie byzantine*, 1 (Bucharest, 1934), 183 f., but cf. 184; M. Thévenot, *Relations de divers voyages curieux*, 1 (Paris, 1696), nos. 13 and 14 (in the Library of Congress copy).

17. *Loc. cit.*, 111 ff.

18. References to the text of Cosmas will be preceded by W. (= Winstedt's edition, p.); thus, here, W. 72.31–73.2; cf. n. 6 *supra*.

19. On these inscriptions and on Cosmas's visit to Mt. Sinai in general, see the chapter by D. Gorce in L. Prévost, L. Dennefeld, etc., *Le Sinai hier . . . aujourd'hui* (Paris, 1937), 159 ff.; Lina Eckenstein, *op. cit.*, 87 ff.; further details on the inscriptions, with additional bibliographical material in A. Kammerer, *Pétra et la Nabatène* (Paris, 1929), 465 ff.; cf. also Gelzer, *loc. cit.*, 112 f.; C. Ritter, *Erdkunde*, 14 (Berlin, 1848), 28, 748 ff.; and n. 6 *supra*.

20. On Clysma itself (W. 138.5–9), see R. Devreesse, "Le christianisme dans la péninsule sinaïtique des origines à l'arrivée des Musulmans," *Revue Biblique*, 49 (1940), 209, and D. Gorce, *loc. cit.*, 160 ff. For the medieval writers and travelers who knew the wheel-ruts of Clysma at first hand, see McCrindle, *op. cit.*, 142, n. 1; Gelzer, *loc. cit.*, 111; and especially *Itinera Hierosolymitana saeculi iii–vii*, ed. by P. Geyer, in *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, 39 (Vienna, 1898), 115.21–116.18 (Petrus Diaconus and St. Silvia [see Devreesse, *loc. cit.*]), 187.13–18 (Antoninus Placentinus); cf. 46.19, 26; 47.2; 117.8–13; 188.9, 14. For additional details cf. the works cited by C. J. Jellouschek, *loc. cit.*

21. In the very passage Gelzer cites, Cosmas merely speaks of his observations when traveling through the country.

22. W. 51.25f.; cf. 52.8; this passage is summarized in the outline of Ms. 1186 published by V. N. Beneshevich, who, to judge from his heading, appreciated its significance: *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum graecorum qui in monasterio Sanctae Catherinae in Monte Sina asservantur* (*Opisanie grecheskikh rukopisei monastyriā Sviatoi Ekateriny na Sinaie*, 1, St. Petersburg, 1911), 433. In my use of Russian books, I owe much to the diligence and skill of Mrs. Nathalie Scheffer.

23. W. 231.20 ff., and cf. the prayer at the end of Book 5 on the same page. See note 10 *supra*.

24. W. 232.4 f.; 232.32 plus 233.4 (Cosmas speaks of Alexandria as being in the third κλίμα and then says ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ κλίματι . . . ἐνταῦθα).

25. W. 63.22 f.; 83.1, 3 (the Nile debouches into τὸν παρ' ἡμῖν κόλπον).

26. W. 37.23–38.5; 69.28 f.; 72.5 f. It is somewhat misleading, however, to quote W. 72.5 f. (ἐνθα καὶ τὴν ἐμπορίαν ποιούμεθα, οἱ ἀπὸ Ἀλεξανδρείας καὶ ἀπὸ Ἐλᾶ ἐμπορεύμενοι . . .), as Wittmann does (see n. 13 *supra* for reference), without discussion. For, if we were to judge by these words alone, it would be impossible to determine whether Cosmas was a citizen of Ela (modern Akabah, at the northernmost extremity of the Gulf of Akabah, an arm of the Red Sea; see the article *Aela* by S. Vailhé in *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques*, 1 (1912), 647 f.), or of Alexandria, or both.

Cf. W. 47.33–48.3, where Cosmas points out that there have been earthquakes in Egypt (see W. *ad loc.* for other texts; I hope to discuss this matter in a paper on Cosmas's relation to Alexandrian science and philosophy); cf. W. 49.13–18 on the climate of the Thebaid.

27. W. 61.6; cf. 62.6 f. and 104.9 f.

28. W. 71.30; 138.25; 232.2, 5, 15, 19 f.; 315, 29; 316.3, 5, 25; 317.5.

29. W. 315.1 f., 24, 28 f.; 316.3, 5 f., 25; 317.4 f. On Timothy and Theodosius, see, in addition to the usual literature in encyclopaedias, etc.: B. Evetts, "History of the patriarchs of the Coptic Church of Alexandria," *Patrologia Orientalis*, 1 (Paris, 1907), fasc. 4, 451–69; E. W. Brooks, "Dates of the Alexandrine patriarchs . . .," *BZ*, 12 (1903), 494–497; A.

Jülicher, "Die Liste der alexandrinischen Patriarchen im 6. u. 7. Jahrh.," *Festgabe, Karl Müller* (Tübingen, 1922), 23.

29a. See Erik Peterson, "Die alexandrinische Liturgie bei Kosmas Indikopleustes," *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, 46 (1932), 66-74; F. E. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, Oxford, 1896, 129.9 ff., 20 ff., and 170.32 ff.

30. W. 52.10 ff.; cf. 62.21; 135.17 f., etc. The identity of Mar Aba and Patricius, first recognized by G. S. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, 3.2 (Rome, 1728), 406, has never been disputed.

31. *Das Buch der Synhados nach einer Handschrift des Museo Borgiano übersetzt u. erläutert* (Stuttgart — Vienna, 1900), 383 f.

32. J. B. Chabot, *Littérature syriaque* (Paris, 1934), 53; A. Baumstark, *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur* (Bonn, 1922), 119; J. Labourt, *Le christianisme dans l'empire perse* (Paris, 1904), 165 f. R. Duval, *La littérature syriaque* (Paris, 1899), 67, mentions only the Alexandrian visit and does not allude to Cosmas; so Barhebraeus, *Chronicon Ecclesiasticum*, ed. J. B. Abbeloos et T. J. Lamy, 3 (Paris-Louvain, 1877), 89. The modern authors cited may have been confused by Mari ibn Soleiman (*De patriarchis ecclesiae orientalis in Maris Amri et Slibae de patriarchis Nestorianorum commentaria*, ed. H. Gismond, Rome, 1899, Pars prior, 44), who speaks of an expedition of Mar Aba and Thomas of Edessa to Constantinople but is silent about a sojourn in Alexandria. The evidence of Cosmas proves that the account in the *Chronique de Séert* (see *infra* and n. 34) is founded upon fact and is not merely a conflation of distinct Alexandrian and Constantinopolitan traditions of the same incident.

33. W. 51.26.

34. Arabic text and French translation by A. Scher in *Patrologia Orientalis*, 7 (Paris, 1911), fasc. 2, 154 ff. An anonymous *Life of Mar Aba* written in Syriac (ed. by P. Bedjan, *Histoire de Mar Jabalaha, de trois autres patriarches, . . . nestoriens*, 2nd ed. Paris, 1895, 217 f., 221) represents Mar Aba as visiting both Alexandria and Constantinople but gives no indication that he was accompanied by Thomas of Edessa. This *Life of Mar Aba*, which apparently dates from the latter half of the sixth century, has been translated by O. Braun, *Bibliothek d. Kirchenväter*, 22 (Kempten-Munich, 1915), 188-220.

35. Cosmas is the authority for the statement that Thomas died in Constantinople. According to other sources, Thomas fled from Constantinople with Mar Aba to Nisibis: *Chronique de Séert* (9th c. or later), *loc. cit.*, 156; M. ibn Soleiman (12th c.), *loc. cit.* This inconsistency is resolved by Baumstark, *op. cit.*, 121, who posits two Thomases, one of whom died in Constantinople, and the other of whom succeeded Mar Aba as Professor of Exegesis at the School of Nisibis. Cf. E. R. Hayes, *L'École d'Edesse* (Paris, 1930), 282; Braun, *op. cit.*, 192 ff.; and n. 32 *supra*.

36. See Winstedt's summary of the evidence of the MSS., *op cit.*, 3.

37. The argument is that, since Photius describes the *Christian Topography* merely as $\chiριστιανοῦ βίβλος$ without naming the author (cod. 36), the name Cosmas, which appears in only one (*Laur. Plut. IX.28*) of the major MSS., is a descriptive appellative chosen by a late scribe as appropriate for a writer on cosmology. But the critics have not accepted this view (see W. 2 f., 19, with references and the works cited in notes 2-4 and 15 [Charton] *supra*). The name Cosmas was common enough in Byzantium; there were three Alexandrian patriarchs named Cosmas. See in addition F. Preisigke, *Namenbuch enthaltend alle griechischen, lateinischen, ägyptischen . . . Menschennamen, soweit sie in griechischen Urkunden (Papyri, Ostraka, Inschriften . . . usw.) Aegyptens sich vorfinden* (Heidelberg, 1922), 183: 20 instances are recorded, making Cosmas one of the commoner names.

Cod. Iberitan. 60, f. 191a (12th cent.), attributes to Cosmas Indicopleustes a number of works written in both Greek and Latin, including one on the names of the apostles, and describes him as the bishop of Tyre who suffered martyrdom during the reign of Julian. See R. A. Lipsius, *Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten u. Apostellegenden*, 1 (Braunschweig, 1883), 195, and *Ergänzungsheft* (*ibid.*, 1890), 3, 15; W. 3. This is, of course, an obvious aberration (Cosmas has been confounded with the semi-legendary Dorotheos of Tyre) and is not to be taken seriously.